

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JUL 15 1996

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20554

COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 ) WT Docket No. 96-18  
of the Commission's Rules to )  
Facilitate Future Development )  
of Paging Systems )  
 )  
Implementation of Section 309(j) ) PP Docket No. 93-253  
of the Communications Act )  
-- Competitive Bidding )

To: The Commission

**COMMENTS OF ARCH COMMUNICATIONS GROUP, INC.  
ON PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Arch Communications Group, Inc. ("Arch"), by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 1.429 of the Commission's Rules, hereby submits its Comments on the Petitions for Reconsideration ("Petitions")<sup>1/</sup> filed with reference to the Commission's First Report and Order<sup>2/</sup> adopted in the captioned proceeding. The following is respectfully shown:

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. Arch provides wireless messaging services, primarily paging, to over 2.7 million units in 38 states, making it the third largest paging carrier in the United

---

<sup>1/</sup> Petitions were filed by TSR Paging, Inc., Metrocall, Inc., Pagemart II, Inc., Ameritech Mobile Services, Inc., Radiofone, Inc., Paging Coalition and the Paging Licensees, Diamond Page Partnerships, America One Partnership, et. al, Motorola, Inc., Paging Network, Inc., the Personal Communications Industry Association, and ProNet, Inc.

<sup>2/</sup> Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of Paging Systems, First Report and Order, FCC 96-183, WT Docket No. 96-18, released April 23, 1996.

States. Arch's operations include local, regional and nationwide common carrier and private paging systems. Arch has participated extensively in this proceeding to date. Arch filed comments and reply comments in response to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making ("NPRM")<sup>3/</sup> with respect to both the Commission's interim licensing proposal and the market area licensing proposal. Thus, Arch has a substantial basis in experience to comment on the latest filed petitions in this proceeding.

2. Arch consistently has urged the Commission to adopt rules governing the market area licensing process as expeditiously as possible. Arch continues to support prompt completion of this proceeding. Notwithstanding the Commission's continuing efforts to adopt final rules promptly, unexpected delays could lengthen the transition period pending the market area licensing event. To the extent that such delays occur, or to the extent that the Commission determines that the proposals set forth in the Petitions could be adopted on an interim basis during the transition, Arch respectfully submits its comments with respect to the petitions filed.

3. Arch recognizes and appreciates the Commission's good faith efforts to mitigate the possible adverse affects of the transition from site-by-site to market area licensing by

---

<sup>3/</sup> Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of Paging Systems, Notice of Proposed Rule Making, FCC 96-52, WT Docket No. 96-18, released February 9, 1996.

the Commission's partial lifting of the freeze, both in the First Report and Order and the Order on Reconsideration of First Report and Order ("Recon Order").<sup>4/</sup> Arch also believes that certain of the positions advocated in the Petitions filed warrant further exploration and support by the Commission.

## **II. APPLICATIONS FILED PRIOR TO THE FREEZE SHOULD BE PROCESSED**

4. Pursuant to the First Report and Order, incumbents may propose facilities during the freeze which are located within 65 kilometers (40 miles) of authorized facilities which were licensed to the incumbent as of February 8, 1996, and are operating as of the date on which the application is filed with the FCC. Several petitioners requested that the Commission further relax the freeze and permit incumbents to rely upon authorized and constructed facilities which were the subject of applications filed with the Commission prior to February 8, 1996, the date on which the freeze commenced.<sup>5/</sup> These petitioners emphasized the lengthy delay in the processing of 931 MHz applications which incumbents experienced as well as the ever-growing demand and changing system needs experienced by paging carriers.

---

<sup>4/</sup> Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of Paging Systems, Order on Reconsideration of First Report and Order, FCC 96-260, WT Docket No. 96-18, released June 11, 1996.

<sup>5/</sup> See Ameritech, p. 2, Paging Coalition, p. 2, ProNet, p. 3, PCIA, pp. 7-9, and Metrocall, pp. 5-7.

5. Since the subject petitions were filed, the Commission has further relaxed the freeze, permitting incumbents to rely upon authorized facilities in the 931 MHz band which were the subject of applications filed on or before September 30, 1995. The further relaxation of the freeze helps certain paging companies meet the demand which prompted them to file these 931 MHz band applications last year. Nevertheless, the Recon Order does not address two critical concerns. First, limiting relief to applications filed with the Commission prior to September 30, 1995 is somewhat arbitrary and does not fully recognize the significant growth in subscriber demand experienced between September and the present. Cutting off carriers' ability to respond to consumer demand for nine months (thus far) inevitably damages their ability to provide the type and quality of service requested by subscribers.

6. Second, the Recon Order does not provide relief to paging companies operating on frequency bands below 931 MHz. Subscriber growth and demand, and changing requirements of system configuration and development, are not unique to the 931 MHz band. Permitting incumbents on lower bands to rely only upon facilities licensed as of February 8, 1996 places these operators at a competitive disadvantage. Such disparate treatment between competing CMRS providers does not fulfill the Commission's goal of achieving regulatory parity among substantially similar services.

7. Arch respectfully suggests that permitting incumbents to rely upon facilities for which applications were pending with the FCC as of February 8, 1996 will not increase or condone speculation as long as construction of the authorized facility is a prerequisite to using the site as the basis of a 40-mile expansion.<sup>6/</sup> Applications filed prior to the commencement of the freeze reflect routine system modification and development. All the petitioners have requested is the ability to rely upon any and all such pre-freeze applications on an equal footing.

### III. ELIGIBILITY TO FILE COMPETING APPLICATIONS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO INCUMBENTS

8. Several petitioners requested that eligibility to file mutually exclusive applications be limited to incumbents.<sup>7/</sup> Arch shares the petitioners' belief that the Commission can decrease the potential for speculation by limiting the eligibility to file competing applications to co-channel incumbents.<sup>8/</sup> By limiting eligibility in this way, the Commission can ensure that the purpose of competing

---

<sup>6/</sup> Arch and the petitioners are not requesting that the Commission process applications filed after February 8, 1996 (in instances other than those the Commission already has permitted by its First Report and Order and Recon Order).

<sup>7/</sup> See Ameritech, pp. 3-4, Paging Coalition, p. 5, ProNet, p. 5, and PageNet, pp. 3-4.

<sup>8/</sup> Arch respectfully suggests that the Commission has the authority to define minimum eligibility criteria where such criteria serve the public interest. See Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. FCC, 326 U.S. 327 (1945).

applications filed is the expansion of existing service areas by bona fide providers of paging services.

9. Arch also supports the petitions which request that the Commission give applicants the option of resolving competing applications by mutually acceptable engineering solutions.<sup>9/</sup> If the Commission limits the eligibility to file competing applications to co-channel incumbents, mutually agreeable resolution of competing applications would permit service to be provided to the public more expeditiously and without risk of speculation. First, since the competing applicants each provide service to the public, a resolution which permits both to implement new or modified facilities in response to customer demand, rather than wait until the completion of the market area licensing event, facilitates the prompt provision higher quality service to subscribers. Second, since non-incumbents, e.g., application mills, would be prohibited from filing competing applications, they would be unable to use competing applications as leverage in settlement discussions and prevent service to subscribers. Initially, and most important, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 which gave the Commission its auction authority explicitly instructed the Commission to continue to consider and permit engineering solutions to mutual exclusivities.<sup>10/</sup>

---

<sup>9/</sup> See PageNet, p. 4, and ProNet, pp. 8-9.

<sup>10/</sup> 47 U.S.C. §309(j)(6)(E).

#### IV. DEFINITION OF PERMISSIVE MODIFICATIONS SHOULD BE MODIFIED

10. As noted above, the Commission has expended considerable effort in achieving workable interim rules for paging companies during the transition to market area licensing. The Commission has been sensitive to paging carriers' needs to make minor system changes in fringe areas in response to consumer demand. In response to the paging industry's expressed need, the Commission has permitted incumbents to modify systems within their existing interference contours. This represented to the Commission a balance between incumbents' need to respond to customer demand and the interest in preserving white space for the impending transition to market area licensing. Arch respectfully suggests that the Commission can permit incumbents to make one additional type of permissive modification to respond to consumer demand without upsetting that balance.

11. Arch suggests that the Commission define as permissive a modification which is intended to fill a gap or crease in an existing system and for which no other applicant could apply absent the consent of the incumbent.<sup>11/</sup> By definition, any such modification would be filed solely for the purpose of providing service to the public, rather than speculation in spectrum. In addition, by prohibiting such modifications, the Commission is effectively denying service

---

<sup>11/</sup> See ProNet, pp. 10-11.

to those crease or gap areas. As proposed, incumbents would only be permitted to make modifications in areas for which no other applicant could apply, given the incumbent's right to protection from harmful interference. Consequently, if the incumbents cannot serve the area, and the geographic licensee also cannot serve the area (assuming the incumbent licensee does not become the geographic licensee), service simply will not be introduced unless the incumbent and geographic licensee reach an agreement with respect to this area. Any such agreement, if reached, is likely to be years down the road, since a geographic licensee's first order of business will be to expand its own system rather than worry about that of an incumbent.

#### **V. ITEMS IN NEED OF CLARIFICATION**

12. The petitioners accurately pointed out that clarification of certain matters relating to the application freeze, and subsequent relaxation of the freeze, would prove very helpful to the industry in proceeding during the transition to market area licensing. First, the Commission should clarify that assignees or transferees of paging authorizations also should be permitted to rely upon all facilities, including applications filed with respect thereto, acquired pursuant to the FCC's approval of an assignment of license or transfer of control application.<sup>12/</sup> Since the FCC approves the acquisition by the assignee or transferee of all

---

<sup>12/</sup> See Metrocall, p. 5.



facilities subject to the underlying assignment or transfer application, the assignee/transferee must be permitted to proceed on the basis of, and enjoy the benefits of, full ownership of those facilities.

13. Arch also agrees that the Commission should clarify what information licensees are required to maintain in their station files as well as what documentation licensees should file with the FCC with respect to permissive system modifications and in order to ensure protection from harmful interference by subsequently placed facilities.<sup>13/</sup> Arch notes that, in an abundance of caution, several carriers are filing FCC Forms 489 to notify the Commission of permissive modifications to systems even though such filings are not required by the NPRM. Thus, further clarification of carriers' filing and record maintenance obligations would be much appreciated.

14. Finally, the Commission should clarify that it will process applications to relocate facilities authorized pursuant to a major modification application where the construction permittee has not yet constructed the authorized facility,<sup>14/</sup> provided that the relocated facility is located within 10 miles of the initially authorized, but unconstructed, facility. By limiting relocation applications

---

<sup>13/</sup> See Metrocall, pp. 8-10.

<sup>14/</sup> See ProNet, pp. 11-12.

in this manner, the Commission will ensure that the sole purpose of the proposal is to relocate a facility due to unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances.

15. In this regard, Arch notes that permittees are occasionally faced with the necessity to relocate a proposed facility due to circumstances beyond their control. Such relocation can be critical during the current freeze where expansion of interference contours is permitted only in limited circumstances, and can prevent a permittee from implementing an authorized facility, or introducing as high a quality service from an authorized facility.

WHEREFORE, the foregoing comments being duly considered, Arch respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider the First Report and Order consistent with these Comments.

Respectfully submitted,

ARCH COMMUNICATIONS GROUP, INC.

By: Carl W. Northrop /*CF*  
Carl W. Northrop

By: Christine M. Crowe /*CF*  
Christine M. Crowe  
Its Attorneys  
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400  
(202) 508-9500

July 15, 1996

**Certificate of Service**

I, Yvette Omar, a secretary with the law firm of Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing **Comments of Arch Communications Group, Inc. on Petitions for Reconsideration**, was sent via first class U.S. mail, postage prepaid, or hand-delivered on this 15th day of July 1996, to the following:

Chairman Reed E. Hundt  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 814  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner James H. Quello  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 802  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Rachelle B. Chong  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 844  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Susan Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 832  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Michele Farquhar, Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Rosalind K. Allen, Deputy Bureau Chief  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 5002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

David Furth, Chief  
Commercial Wireless Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 7002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mika Savir, Esquire  
Commercial Wireless Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 7002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Rhonda Lien, Esquire  
Commercial Wireless Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
2025 M Street, N.W.  
ROOM 7002  
Washington, D.C. 20554

A. Thomas Carroccio  
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd  
1615 L Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for A+ Communications

Frederick M. Joyce  
Joyce & Jacobs  
1019 19th Street, N.W.  
14th Floor, PH-2  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for A+ Network and Metrocall

George Y. Wheeler  
Koteen & Naftalin  
1150 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for American Paging, Inc.

Dennis L. Myers  
Vice President/General Counsel  
Ameritech Mobile Services, Inc.  
2000 West Ameritech Center Dr.  
Location 3H78  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195

Timothy E. Welch  
Hill & Welch  
1330 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Suite 113  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for Mashell Tel, B&B,  
Wilkinson, PAI, Benkelman/  
Wauneta, Supercom, Inc.,  
Chequamegon, Baldwin/Amery, etc.

Robert H. Schwaninger, Jr.  
Brown and Schwaninger  
Suite 650  
1835 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Counsel for Small Business in Telecommunications

Veronica M. Ahern  
Nixon, Hargrave, Devans & Doyle  
One Thomas Circle  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Counsel for Consolidated  
Communications Mobile Services, Inc.

John L. Crump  
d/b/a ACE Communications  
11403 Waples Mill Road  
Post Office Box 3070  
Oakton, Virginia 22124

William L. Fishman  
Sullivan & Worcester LLP  
1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for Diamond Page  
Partnerships, AmericaOne  
and Affiliated Entities

Harold Mordkofsky  
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens  
2120 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Counsel for the Paging Licensees, Teletouch  
Licenses, Inc., The Paging Coalition, National  
Telephone Cooperative, Radiofone, and  
Nucla-Naturita

Thomas Gutierrez  
Lukas, McGowan, Nace &  
Gutierrez, Chartered  
1111 Nineteenth St., N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for Preferred  
Networks, Jon D. Word, Pioneer Telephone,  
Mobile Telecomms. Techn., Liberty  
Cellular, and PageMart

William J. Franklin, Chartered  
1200 G Street, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3814  
Counsel for Caraway Communications

David L. Hill  
Audrey P. Rasmussen  
O'Connor & Hannan, L.L.P.  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20006-3483  
Counsel for Paging Partners Corp. and  
Source One Wireless, Inc.

Judith St. Ledger-Roty  
Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100 - East Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Counsel for Paging Network, Inc.

Katherine M. Holden  
Wiley, Rein & Fielding  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Counsel for PCIA

Amelia L. Brown  
Henry A. Solomon  
Haley, Bader & Potts, P.L.C.  
4350 North Fairfax Dr.  
Suite 900  
Arlington, VA 22203-1633  
Counsel for Pass Word, Inc.  
and its affiliate Coeur d'Alene Answering,  
and Western Radio Services Co.

Jerome K. Blask  
Gurman, Blask & Freedman, Chartered  
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel to Pronet, Inc.

Richard S. Becker & Associates  
1915 Eye Street, N.W.  
Eighth Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Counsel for TSR Paging,

Ellen S. Mandell  
Pepper & Corazzini, L.L.P.  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Ste. 200  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Counsel for Priority Communications

Lawrence M. Miller  
Schwartz, Woods & Miller  
1350 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Counsel for Datafon II, Inc. and  
Zipcall Long Distance

Caressa D. Bennet  
Michael R. Bennet  
Bennet & Bennet, PLLC  
1831 Ontario Place, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Counsel for Border to Border  
Communications, Inc.

Joe D. Edge  
Tina M. Pidgeon  
Drinker Biddle & Reath  
901 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Counsel for Puerto Rico Telephone Company

Kenneth E. Hardman  
Moir & Hardman  
2000 L Street, N.W., Ste. 512  
Washington, D.C. 20036-4907  
Counsel for United Paging Resources

Laura H. Phillips  
Christina H. Burrow  
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson  
1200 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036-6802  
Counsel for Sunbelt  
Transmission Corp. and Snider  
Comms. Corp.

William Ciuffo  
John Sieber  
Comp Comm, Inc.  
One Echelon Plaza, Ste. 100  
227 Laurel Road  
Voorhees, NJ 08043-2331

Larry Shaefer, President  
SMR Systems, Inc.  
4212 Mt. Vernon  
Houston, TX 77006-5416

Lloyd D. Huffman  
Huffman Communications  
2829 W. 7th Ave. Box 1753  
Corsicana, TX 75151-1753

Brian G. Kiernan, Vice President  
InterDigital Communications Corp.  
781 Third Avenue  
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mary McDermott  
U.S. Telephone Association  
1401 H Street, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005



Lucille M. Mates  
140 New Montgomery St.  
Rm. 1526  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Counsel for Pacific Bell

Margaret E. Garber  
1275 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Counsel for Pacific Bell

James F. Rogers  
Kevin C. Boyle  
Latham & Watkins  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Suite 1300  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Counsel for PageAmerica Group, Inc.  
and MobileMedia Communications, Inc.


David C. Jatlow  
Young & Jatlow  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Counsel for AT&T Wireless Services

Mr. Robert R. Rule  
Rule Radiophone Service, Inc. and  
Robert R. Rule d/b/a Rule Communications  
2232 Dell Range Boulevard  
Cheyenne, WY 82009

Lisa M. Zaina, Esquire  
OPASTCO  
21 DuPont Circle, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dallas Vanderhoof  
General Manager  
TeleBEEPER of New Mexico, Inc.  
P.O. Box 25161  
Albuquerque, NM 87125

Heather Hipsley, Esquire  
Federal Trade Commission  
Bureau of Consumer Protection  
6th Str. & Pennsylvania Ave.  
Room 200  
Washington, D.C. 20580



---

Yvette Omar